



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,142	03/29/2006	Gerardus P. Karman	2003P00715WOUS	8679

24737 7590 07/27/2011  
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
----------

SPAR, ILANA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/27/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com  
debbie.henn@philips.com  
marianne.fox@philips.com

<b><i>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/574,142	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KARMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ILANA SPAR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
Applicant has argued that Marz fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 1 because Marz does not teach "a plurality of groups with each group including a plurality of pixels, a number of pixels in each group corresponding to a number of the different views..." Examiner respectfully disagrees, and cites Marz at column 6, lines 26-42 and Figure 9 as evidence that Marz does teach a plurality of groups of pixels with each pixel in each group corresponding to a different view. Figure 9 shows a display that presents two images, 45 and 46, to two separate viewing angles. The two images are generated by interleaving image data for the two images, such that each column of data alternates between left image data and right image data. As this relates to the claim language, there can be understood to be a plurality of pixel groups, each comprising two pixels, where the left pixel of the group corresponds to the left image, and the right pixel of the group corresponds to the right image. Then, when the gray-scale signals are adjusted as taught by column 5, lines 28-53, the gray-scale levels will be adjusted for each pixel corresponding to each viewing angle, as specified by the claim. Marz does not teach the particular method by which multiple viewing angle images are generated in the previously cited section, at column 6, lines 43-59, but the method of interleaving images as shown in Figure 9 can be applied to the multiple images displayed by Figure 10 as well. As to Applicant's argument that Marz teaches adjusting the reference potential of the counter-electrode, which is common to all pixels, Examiner points to column 5, lines 36-41, where rather than adjusting the counter-electrode, the values of the gray levels themselves may be changed. This directly corresponds to Applicant's teaching of a different correction being applied to each pixel within each pixel group. Applicant's contention that Marz does not teach "resolving a problem of grey scale dependency as the light rays of the different views travel through the liquid crystal layer at different angles..." is not reflected in the claim language, and Applicant must amend the claims to include this teaching if this point is intended to be integral to the invention and Applicant contends that this is a distinguishing feature between the current invention and the prior art, rather than providing arguments that do not reflect the currently pending claim language.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

/Bipin Shalwala/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629